

BREWERS ASK COURT TO HALT BONE DRY LAW

Action Aimed to Involve U. S. Officers Who Enforce Prohibition.

WANT PERCENTAGE RULE

Seeking of Injunction in Advance of Proceedings Is Unusual Feature.

A new move was made yesterday by the brewers in the fight to save light beer, when the Jacob Hoffmann Brewing Company, Inc., instituted injunction proceedings in the Federal District Court against Mark Elmer, as Internal Revenue Collector for the Third New York District, and Francis G. Caffey, as United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York, to restrain them from carrying out the bone dry prohibition order of November 21, 1918.

An extraordinary feature of the suit is that it seeks an injunction in advance and in anticipation of any attempt by the Government agents to enforce the law.

Purposes of Action.

But the two main purposes of the present proceeding, which distinguish it from that suit, are first, to involve directly in litigation the officers of the Government charged with putting into effect the bone dry provision, and secondly, to obtain a court ruling on what percentage of alcoholic content makes a beverage intoxicating.

In the Elmer case the Government was not involved, and the contention that beer with 2 1/2 per cent of alcohol was permissible was brought in only as a secondary matter. In this case the burden of the complaint is focused upon it. In both cases the complainants are represented by the same attorneys, E. R. Root, William D. Guthrie.

This case is looked upon as an outgrowth of the opinion they gave to the Lager Beer Brewers' Association of New York. In this special counsel declared that Daniel C. Roper, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, had no legal authority for fixing the non-intoxicating limit of one-half of 1 per cent of alcohol and advised injunction proceedings to prevent the prohibition law from being interpreted in this way.

The action begun yesterday is called a friendly suit; as the office of the Internal Revenue collector is represented by the Government, and the suit is brought on the limit of non-intoxicating beer determining on its future course. Most of the brewers, pending this decision, are holding up their preparations to go ahead with the production of 2 1/2 per cent beer, following the Root-Guthrie opinion, though the Jacob Ruppert Brewing Company is said to be already in a position to market this product.

The United States Brewers Association in sending out copies of the Root-Guthrie opinion made no general recommendation, simply leaving it to the individual judgment of their members as to how they should act on it. It was the unofficial conviction of some of the legal representatives of the brewers that they would have to start separate actions at law and would not be allowed to join as complainants in the present case in the event that they decided to fight on the limit.

The papers filed yesterday are in the nature of a bill in equity, signed and attested by William D. Guthrie, E. R. Root, William D. Guthrie and William L. Marbury are counsel for the complainant. The bill recites the following preliminary facts:

The company was incorporated in 1887, succeeding the brewing business established in 1847 by Jacob Hoffmann.

It has outstanding capital stock of \$400,000 in 400 shares of \$1,000 each.

Its business in the manufacture and sale of beer and other malt liquors prior to January 1, 1918, amounted to \$1,360,000 a year. The company owns four parcels of real estate in the city, which are used for its brewery business and have an aggregate assessed valuation of \$411,000. Its plant and other personal property have a present book value in excess of \$750,000.

During the last three years it has sold its wares to 225 customers each year and during that period it sold the following number of barrels: In 1916 171,792, 162,985 in 1917 and 121,840 in 1918. It employs more than 250 men, with a total monthly payroll of \$10,000. The average net profit during the three year period were approximately \$150,000.

The bill does not call into question the Eighteenth Amendment to the Constitution.

In addition to asserting that the signing of the armistice—a copy of which is appended—removed the necessity for conserving cereals and grains to careen the war, the bill states that since that time there is no sense at all for the national defense, the bill of complaints avers: "That beer and other malt liquors which contain not in excess of 2 1/2 per cent of alcohol by weight are not in fact intoxicating when used for beverage purposes, and therefore were not and are not within the intent, scope and purview of the said act of Congress of November 21, 1918, and as fully appear by reference to the terms and provisions of section 1 of said act, and that all and singular the beer manufactured and sold by complainant since August 10, 1917, has contained not in excess of 2 1/2 per cent of alcohol by weight, which is equivalent to 2.3 per cent by volume.

Intent of Act Shown.

"Complainant is advised by counsel, and therefore avers that according to the true intent and meaning of said act of Congress of November 21, 1918, the manufacture and sale of non-intoxicating beer and other non-intoxicating malt liquor for beverage purposes were not and are not prohibited thereby and that the beer and malt liquor now produced, manufactured and sold by complainant are not intoxicating as matter of fact and were not and are not therefore within the intent, scope and purview of said act of Congress.

"And complainant is also advised by counsel and, therefore, avers that said act of Congress of November 21, 1918, in so far as it purports to apply to the production, manufacture or sale of intoxicating beer or other intoxicating malt liquor for beverage purposes is unconstitutional and void because in excess of and unauthorized by any power delegated to or vested in the Congress or any department or officer thereof under and by virtue of the Constitution of the United States.

"As more fully appears from the copies of the regulations or decisions of the Commission of Internal Revenue herewith attached, said Federal officer has construed the said act of Congress, with the consent and approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, as forbidding the use after May 1, 1919, of grains, cereals, fruits or other food products in the manufacture of beer or other malt liquors containing more than one per cent of more of alcohol by volume, and as forbidding the sale after June 20, 1919, of beer or other malt liquors of said alcoholic content.

"Notwithstanding the fact that such construction of said act of Congress is erroneous, unconstitutional and void, that it exceeds the authority conferred upon the Commissioner of Internal Revenue by the President in and by the proclamation of March 1, 1919, and is in violation of the purpose, intent and threat of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, his agents and subordinates, including the defendant Mark Elmer, as Internal Revenue Collector for the Third New York District, and Francis G. Caffey, as United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York, to restrain them from carrying out the bone dry prohibition order of November 21, 1918.

"The defendant Mark Elmer, as Internal Revenue Collector for the Third New York District, and Francis G. Caffey, as United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York, to restrain them from carrying out the bone dry prohibition order of November 21, 1918.

"The defendant Mark Elmer, as Internal Revenue Collector for the Third New York District, and Francis G. Caffey, as United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York, to restrain them from carrying out the bone dry prohibition order of November 21, 1918.

"The defendant Mark Elmer, as Internal Revenue Collector for the Third New York District, and Francis G. Caffey, as United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York, to restrain them from carrying out the bone dry prohibition order of November 21, 1918.

constitutional and void because in excess of and unauthorized by any power delegated to or vested in the Congress or any department or officer thereof under and by virtue of the Constitution of the United States.

"As more fully appears from the copies of the regulations or decisions of the Commission of Internal Revenue herewith attached, said Federal officer has construed the said act of Congress, with the consent and approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, as forbidding the use after May 1, 1919, of grains, cereals, fruits or other food products in the manufacture of beer or other malt liquors containing more than one per cent of more of alcohol by volume, and as forbidding the sale after June 20, 1919, of beer or other malt liquors of said alcoholic content.

"Notwithstanding the fact that such construction of said act of Congress is erroneous, unconstitutional and void, that it exceeds the authority conferred upon the Commissioner of Internal Revenue by the President in and by the proclamation of March 1, 1919, and is in violation of the purpose, intent and threat of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, his agents and subordinates, including the defendant Mark Elmer, as Internal Revenue Collector for the Third New York District, and Francis G. Caffey, as United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York, to restrain them from carrying out the bone dry prohibition order of November 21, 1918.

"The defendant Mark Elmer, as Internal Revenue Collector for the Third New York District, and Francis G. Caffey, as United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York, to restrain them from carrying out the bone dry prohibition order of November 21, 1918.

"The defendant Mark Elmer, as Internal Revenue Collector for the Third New York District, and Francis G. Caffey, as United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York, to restrain them from carrying out the bone dry prohibition order of November 21, 1918.

"The defendant Mark Elmer, as Internal Revenue Collector for the Third New York District, and Francis G. Caffey, as United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York, to restrain them from carrying out the bone dry prohibition order of November 21, 1918.

"The defendant Mark Elmer, as Internal Revenue Collector for the Third New York District, and Francis G. Caffey, as United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York, to restrain them from carrying out the bone dry prohibition order of November 21, 1918.

"The defendant Mark Elmer, as Internal Revenue Collector for the Third New York District, and Francis G. Caffey, as United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York, to restrain them from carrying out the bone dry prohibition order of November 21, 1918.

"The defendant Mark Elmer, as Internal Revenue Collector for the Third New York District, and Francis G. Caffey, as United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York, to restrain them from carrying out the bone dry prohibition order of November 21, 1918.

"The defendant Mark Elmer, as Internal Revenue Collector for the Third New York District, and Francis G. Caffey, as United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York, to restrain them from carrying out the bone dry prohibition order of November 21, 1918.

"The defendant Mark Elmer, as Internal Revenue Collector for the Third New York District, and Francis G. Caffey, as United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York, to restrain them from carrying out the bone dry prohibition order of November 21, 1918.

"The defendant Mark Elmer, as Internal Revenue Collector for the Third New York District, and Francis G. Caffey, as United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York, to restrain them from carrying out the bone dry prohibition order of November 21, 1918.

"The defendant Mark Elmer, as Internal Revenue Collector for the Third New York District, and Francis G. Caffey, as United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York, to restrain them from carrying out the bone dry prohibition order of November 21, 1918.

"The defendant Mark Elmer, as Internal Revenue Collector for the Third New York District, and Francis G. Caffey, as United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York, to restrain them from carrying out the bone dry prohibition order of November 21, 1918.

"The defendant Mark Elmer, as Internal Revenue Collector for the Third New York District, and Francis G. Caffey, as United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York, to restrain them from carrying out the bone dry prohibition order of November 21, 1918.

"The defendant Mark Elmer, as Internal Revenue Collector for the Third New York District, and Francis G. Caffey, as United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York, to restrain them from carrying out the bone dry prohibition order of November 21, 1918.

"The defendant Mark Elmer, as Internal Revenue Collector for the Third New York District, and Francis G. Caffey, as United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York, to restrain them from carrying out the bone dry prohibition order of November 21, 1918.

"The defendant Mark Elmer, as Internal Revenue Collector for the Third New York District, and Francis G. Caffey, as United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York, to restrain them from carrying out the bone dry prohibition order of November 21, 1918.

"The defendant Mark Elmer, as Internal Revenue Collector for the Third New York District, and Francis G. Caffey, as United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York, to restrain them from carrying out the bone dry prohibition order of November 21, 1918.

"The defendant Mark Elmer, as Internal Revenue Collector for the Third New York District, and Francis G. Caffey, as United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York, to restrain them from carrying out the bone dry prohibition order of November 21, 1918.

"The defendant Mark Elmer, as Internal Revenue Collector for the Third New York District, and Francis G. Caffey, as United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York, to restrain them from carrying out the bone dry prohibition order of November 21, 1918.

"The defendant Mark Elmer, as Internal Revenue Collector for the Third New York District, and Francis G. Caffey, as United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York, to restrain them from carrying out the bone dry prohibition order of November 21, 1918.

"The defendant Mark Elmer, as Internal Revenue Collector for the Third New York District, and Francis G. Caffey, as United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York, to restrain them from carrying out the bone dry prohibition order of November 21, 1918.

"The defendant Mark Elmer, as Internal Revenue Collector for the Third New York District, and Francis G. Caffey, as United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York, to restrain them from carrying out the bone dry prohibition order of November 21, 1918.

"The defendant Mark Elmer, as Internal Revenue Collector for the Third New York District, and Francis G. Caffey, as United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York, to restrain them from carrying out the bone dry prohibition order of November 21, 1918.

"The defendant Mark Elmer, as Internal Revenue Collector for the Third New York District, and Francis G. Caffey, as United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York, to restrain them from carrying out the bone dry prohibition order of November 21, 1918.

"The defendant Mark Elmer, as Internal Revenue Collector for the Third New York District, and Francis G. Caffey, as United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York, to restrain them from carrying out the bone dry prohibition order of November 21, 1918.

"The defendant Mark Elmer, as Internal Revenue Collector for the Third New York District, and Francis G. Caffey, as United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York, to restrain them from carrying out the bone dry prohibition order of November 21, 1918.

"The defendant Mark Elmer, as Internal Revenue Collector for the Third New York District, and Francis G. Caffey, as United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York, to restrain them from carrying out the bone dry prohibition order of November 21, 1918.

"The defendant Mark Elmer, as Internal Revenue Collector for the Third New York District, and Francis G. Caffey, as United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York, to restrain them from carrying out the bone dry prohibition order of November 21, 1918.

"The defendant Mark Elmer, as Internal Revenue Collector for the Third New York District, and Francis G. Caffey, as United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York, to restrain them from carrying out the bone dry prohibition order of November 21, 1918.

"The defendant Mark Elmer, as Internal Revenue Collector for the Third New York District, and Francis G. Caffey, as United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York, to restrain them from carrying out the bone dry prohibition order of November 21, 1918.

"The defendant Mark Elmer, as Internal Revenue Collector for the Third New York District, and Francis G. Caffey, as United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York, to restrain them from carrying out the bone dry prohibition order of November 21, 1918.

"The defendant Mark Elmer, as Internal Revenue Collector for the Third New York District, and Francis G. Caffey, as United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York, to restrain them from carrying out the bone dry prohibition order of November 21, 1918.

"The defendant Mark Elmer, as Internal Revenue Collector for the Third New York District, and Francis G. Caffey, as United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York, to restrain them from carrying out the bone dry prohibition order of November 21, 1918.

"The defendant Mark Elmer, as Internal Revenue Collector for the Third New York District, and Francis G. Caffey, as United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York, to restrain them from carrying out the bone dry prohibition order of November 21, 1918.

"The defendant Mark Elmer, as Internal Revenue Collector for the Third New York District, and Francis G. Caffey, as United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York, to restrain them from carrying out the bone dry prohibition order of November 21, 1918.

"The defendant Mark Elmer, as Internal Revenue Collector for the Third New York District, and Francis G. Caffey, as United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York, to restrain them from carrying out the bone dry prohibition order of November 21, 1918.

"The defendant Mark Elmer, as Internal Revenue Collector for the Third New York District, and Francis G. Caffey, as United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York, to restrain them from carrying out the bone dry prohibition order of November 21, 1918.

"The defendant Mark Elmer, as Internal Revenue Collector for the Third New York District, and Francis G. Caffey, as United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York, to restrain them from carrying out the bone dry prohibition order of November 21, 1918.

"The defendant Mark Elmer, as Internal Revenue Collector for the Third New York District, and Francis G. Caffey, as United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York, to restrain them from carrying out the bone dry prohibition order of November 21, 1918.

"The defendant Mark Elmer, as Internal Revenue Collector for the Third New York District, and Francis G. Caffey, as United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York, to restrain them from carrying out the bone dry prohibition order of November 21, 1918.

"The defendant Mark Elmer, as Internal Revenue Collector for the Third New York District, and Francis G. Caffey, as United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York, to restrain them from carrying out the bone dry prohibition order of November 21, 1918.

"The defendant Mark Elmer, as Internal Revenue Collector for the Third New York District, and Francis G. Caffey, as United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York, to restrain them from carrying out the bone dry prohibition order of November 21, 1918.

LARGE LOANS OR SMALL ONES

We have plenty of money for loans on improved property in any Borough of Greater New York.

Our fees are moderate, our answers prompt and you pay the current rate of interest.

May we have the opportunity to consider your application?

TITLE GUARANTEE & TRUST CO

Capital \$5,000,000
Surplus \$11,000,000
175 Nassau St., 13th Fl., N. Y. C.
200 Nassau St., 13th Fl., N. Y. C.
80 Bay Street, St. George, Staten Island

ANDERSON CALLS ON WALTERS TO DEBATE

Challenge to Word Duel Over Brewery Charges, Sets Place as Syracuse.

Special Dispatch to The Sun.

ALBANY, March 19.—Senator J. Henry Walters of Syracuse, Republican leader of the Senate, was challenged to-night to a public "duel" by William H. Anderson, State Superintendent of the Anti-Saloon League.

Pistols and coffee for two will be unnecessary, but a few glasses of water will be needed, for the duel would take the form of a public debate, right in Mr. Walters's own city of Syracuse.

Mr. Anderson said unkind things about Senator Walters depicting upon the support of German brewers for election as majority leader of the Senate last January. A few days ago in the Senate the Republican leader accused Mr. Anderson of telling a deliberate lie about him.

Letter From Anderson.

Now we have this letter from Mr. Anderson to Senator Walters:

"My original statement about you was made in the open, where you had access to identical the same means for answering them. Your latest statement was from the privileged protection of the Senate floor, where I had no chance. Now, in order to equalize things, I intend that you shall make your denials and charges where they can be answered, dissected and exploded on the spot.

"I therefore challenge you to a public debate, in your own city of Syracuse, which you claim is against prohibition. Realizing that you are busy during the session, I propose some mutually satisfactory date above the city of Syracuse, at the close of the session, or, if you prefer to postpone it until the next time you are a candidate (provided you conclude to run again), and will now in writing accept the challenge for such future date, I will agree to the postponement. If you do not accept I will be free to live a hell in Syracuse for the purpose of discussing your record when you are a candidate for reelection, or for Governor.

Mr. Anderson said if Senator Walters agrees to the debate, "I will undertake to prove that you have been consistently lined up with German brewers and that what has been said about you by the Anti-Saloon League was warranted by the facts."

Senator Walters had nothing to say to-night about the challenge for a verbal duel.

Walters Is Silent.

Mr. Anderson said if Senator Walters agrees to the debate, "I will undertake to prove that you have been consistently lined up with German brewers and that what has been said about you by the Anti-Saloon League was warranted by the facts."

Senator Walters had nothing to say to-night about the challenge for a verbal duel.

Walters Is Silent.

Mr. Anderson said if Senator Walters agrees to the debate, "I will undertake to prove that you have been consistently lined up with German brewers and that what has been said about you by the Anti-Saloon League was warranted by the facts."

Senator Walters had nothing to say to-night about the challenge for a verbal duel.

Walters Is Silent.

Mr. Anderson said if Senator Walters agrees to the debate, "I will undertake to prove that you have been consistently lined up with German brewers and that what has been said about you by the Anti-Saloon League was warranted by the facts."

Senator Walters had nothing to say to-night about the challenge for a verbal duel.

Walters Is Silent.

Mr. Anderson said if Senator Walters agrees to the debate, "I will undertake to prove that you have been consistently lined up with German brewers and that what has been said about you by the Anti-Saloon League was warranted by the facts."

Senator Walters had nothing to say to-night about the challenge for a verbal duel.

Walters Is Silent.

Mr. Anderson said if Senator Walters agrees to the debate, "I will undertake to prove that you have been consistently lined up with German brewers and that what has been said about you by the Anti-Saloon League was warranted by the facts."

Senator Walters had nothing to say to-night about the challenge for a verbal duel.

Walters Is Silent.

Mr. Anderson said if Senator Walters agrees to the debate, "I will undertake to prove that you have been consistently lined up with German brewers and that what has been said about you by the Anti-Saloon League was warranted by the facts."

Senator Walters had nothing to say to-night about the challenge for a verbal duel.

Walters Is Silent.

Mr. Anderson said if Senator Walters agrees to the debate, "I will undertake to prove that you have been consistently lined up with German brewers and that what has been said about you by the Anti-Saloon League was warranted by the facts."

Senator Walters had nothing to say to-night about the challenge for a verbal duel.

Walters Is Silent.

Mr. Anderson said if Senator Walters agrees to the debate, "I will undertake to prove that you have been consistently lined up with German brewers and that what has been said about you by the Anti-Saloon League was warranted by the facts."

Senator Walters had nothing to say to-night about the challenge for a verbal duel.

Walters Is Silent.

Mr. Anderson said if Senator Walters agrees to the debate, "I will undertake to prove that you have been consistently lined up with German brewers and that what has been said about you by the Anti-Saloon League was warranted by the facts."

BOAT OWNERS JOIN HANDS TO END TIEP

Will Engage Discharged Soldiers and Sailors to Break Strike.

LONGSHOREMEN RESTIVE

42,000 Threaten to Quit—Big Stick Flourished by U. S. Government.

Hope for any settlement of the harbor strike was abandoned yesterday when it became known that to-day the owners of tugs, lighters and barges in the port of New York will coordinate their resources and make a determined effort to break the tiep.

The New York Towboat Exchange will advertise for any holding pilot of engineer licenses and those having any experience in tug, barge and lightering will be taken on. There are already several hundred soldiers employed by the boat owners for the protection of their property.

Forty-two thousand longshoremen threatened to quit yesterday because it was found some of them were handling cargoes from boats of private owners, and if need be the strike officials will use the longshoremen as a whip to strengthen their fight. Boat owners are prepared to meet this situation, and they will call the men off the transatlantic liners and demand that the bottom of England, Ireland and France also quit.

Federal Big Stick Raised.

The "big stick" of the United States Government which Federal officials threatened would wave over the boat owners and strikers if Government resources were interfered with landed on the strike. Gen. Frank T. Hines, Chief of Transportation Service, was telegraphed by the Commanding General of the Port of Embarkation, Hoboken, and it was forwarded by Gen. Shanks's office to the strike committee.

Your superintendent of water transportation reports commercial troop vessels delayed due to direct and indirect cause of strike, port of New York, vessels named, Gen. Maurelania and Belgic for British and the Niagara for French. The importance of all operations connected with the trade and commerce is overstated, and this matter should be called to the attention of those connected with strike of marine workers.

The result was that Thomas L. DeLahunty, one of the labor leaders who decided the striking marine workers "would go to all in their power to aid the strikers," and that the departure of vessels is expedited.

A. H. Smith, Regional Director of the United States Coast Guard, is also expediting the departure of vessels.

The result was that Thomas L. DeLahunty, one of the labor leaders who decided the striking marine workers "would go to all in their power to aid the strikers," and that the departure of vessels is expedited.

A. H. Smith, Regional Director of the United States Coast Guard, is also expediting the departure of vessels.

The result was that Thomas L. DeLahunty, one of the labor leaders who decided the striking marine workers "would go to all in their power to aid the strikers," and that the departure of vessels is expedited.

A. H. Smith, Regional Director of the United States Coast Guard, is also expediting the departure of vessels.

The result was that Thomas L. DeLahunty, one of the labor leaders who decided the striking marine workers "would go to all in their power to aid the strikers," and that the departure of vessels is expedited.

A. H. Smith, Regional Director of the United States Coast Guard, is also expediting the departure of vessels.

The result was that Thomas L. DeLahunty, one of the labor leaders who decided the striking marine workers "would go to all in their power to aid the strikers," and that the departure of vessels is expedited.

A. H. Smith, Regional Director of the United States Coast Guard, is also expediting the departure of vessels.

The result was that Thomas L. DeLahunty, one of the labor leaders who decided the striking marine workers "would go to all in their power to aid the strikers," and that the departure of vessels is expedited.

A. H. Smith, Regional Director of the United States Coast Guard, is also expediting the departure of vessels.

The result was that Thomas L. DeLahunty, one of the labor leaders who decided the striking marine workers "would go to all in their power to aid the strikers," and that the departure of vessels is expedited.

A. H. Smith, Regional Director of the United States Coast Guard, is also expediting the departure of vessels.

The result was that Thomas L. DeLahunty, one of the labor leaders who decided the striking marine workers "would go to all in their power to aid the strikers," and that the departure of vessels is expedited.

A. H. Smith, Regional Director of the United States Coast Guard, is also expediting the departure of vessels.

The result was that Thomas L. DeLahunty, one of the labor leaders who decided the striking marine workers "would go to all in their power to aid the strikers," and that the departure of vessels is expedited.

A. H. Smith, Regional Director of the United States Coast Guard, is also expediting the departure of vessels.

The result was that Thomas L. DeLahunty, one of the labor leaders who decided the striking marine workers "would go to all in their power to aid the strikers," and that the departure of vessels is expedited.

A. H. Smith, Regional Director of the United States Coast Guard, is also expediting the departure of vessels.

The result was that Thomas L. DeLahunty, one of the labor leaders who decided the striking marine workers "would go to all in their power to aid the strikers," and that the departure of vessels is expedited.

A. H. Smith, Regional Director of the United States Coast Guard, is also expediting the departure of vessels.

The result was that Thomas L. DeLahunty, one of the labor leaders who decided the striking marine workers "would go to all in their power to aid the strikers," and that the departure of vessels is expedited.

A. H. Smith, Regional Director of the United States Coast Guard, is also expediting the departure of vessels